

## **REMARKS**

In view of the preceding amendments and the comments which follow, and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, amendment and reconsideration of the Office Action, mailed on June 14, 2005 is respectfully requested by Applicants.

### **Summary**

Claims 16 – 19 and 27 – 29 stand rejected. Claim 27 has been amended, and Claim 30 has been added. No new matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments. Claims 16 – 19 and 27 – 30 are pending following entry of the present remarks.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 27, 16, 17, 19, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lemelson (U.S. Patent 3,154,890), Schulze (U.S. Patent 2,783,391) or Goldsmith (U.S. Patent 4,408,366) in view of either Faidley (U.S. Patent 2,896,649) or Umezawa (U.S. Patent 4,740,726).

Claim 27 is directed to a wet treatment nozzle. The wet treatment nozzle comprises an ultrasonic cleaner, an introduction passage for introducing a treatment liquid on a side of the ultrasonic cleaner, and an exhaust passage which exhausts the treatment liquid on another side of the ultrasonic cleaner after a wet treatment of an object to be treated.

Claim 27 has been amended to recite that a pressure controller maintains a difference between a pressure of the treatment liquid in contact with the object to be treated and an atmospheric pressure, so that the treatment liquid wet treats only a portion of the object to be treated to which the treatment liquid is supplied.

Applicants also submit that the cited references may not properly be combined to reject Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) because Lemelson, Schulze and Goldsmith fail to teach or suggest the claimed structure of the wet treatment nozzle.

Lemelson discloses that the ultrasonic device comprises an elongated housing having a forward wall or nose which is made of deformable material such as rubber or plastic which defines an opening in the end of the housing and which may sealingly

engage the work member when the device is urged thereagainst and the forward end of the nose deforms (See column 3, lines 74 -75 and column 4, lines 1 – 10).

Schulze discloses that the sealing strip formed by the underside of the flange of the casing may be formed of resiliently yielding material, such as rubber, foamed plastics or a dense row of bristles, laminations or slides (See column 4, lines 18 – 23)

Goldsmith discloses a cleaning system for carpets, and thus does not attempt to prevent a treatment liquid from leaking outside of carpet portions being cleaned.

Hence, Lemelson, Schulze and Goldsmith fail to teach or disclose that the pressure controller maintains a difference between a pressure of the treatment liquid in contact with the object to be treated and an atmospheric pressure, so that the treatment liquid wet treats only a portion of the object to be treated to which the treatment liquid is supplied.

Faidley or Umezawa, cited by the Examiner as disclosing a weight provided on the housing of the ultrasonic cleaner, also fail to teach or suggest the above-discussed claimed feature of Claim 27.

Therefore, reference combinations of Lemelson, Schulze or Goldsmith, with Faidley or Umezawa may not properly be used to reject Claim 27 under 35 USC 103(a).

Accordingly Claim 27 is allowable, as well as dependent Claims 16, 17, 19, 28 and 29.

The Examiner has further rejected Claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to Claim 27, and further in view of Eppes (U.S. Patent 4,764,021). Eppes also fails to teach or suggest the claimed structure of the wet treatment nozzle.

Thus, Claim 18 which is dependent on Claim 27 is also allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections of Claims under 35 USC 103(a) be withdrawn.

## Conclusion

Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, and favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. If, there are any fees due, Applicants request that this paper constitutes any necessary petition and authorizes the Commissioner to charge any underpayment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-1925.

If the examiner finds that there are any outstanding issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Brinks, Hofer, Gilson & Lione

By

  
Gustavo Siller, Jr.  
Registration No. 32,305

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200